

CALIFORNIA CENTER
FOR
PUBLIC DISPUTE RESOLUTION

A Joint Program of
CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, SACRAMENTO
McGEORGE SCHOOL OF LAW,
UNIVERSITY OF THE PACIFIC

26 November 1996

PRINCIPALS

Susan Sherry
Executive Director
CSU, Sacramento

Edwin Villmoare
Director of Programs/
General Counsel
McGeorge School of Law

Kathleen Chovan
Mediator/Attorney
McGeorge School of Law

TO: Lester Snow, Dick Daniel
FROM: Eugenia Laychak and Martha Turner *ms*
SUBJECT: Debrief of Introduction to Restoration Targets Workshop

With the workshop behind us and the Environmental Restoration Program Plan workshop later this winter, it is useful to review accomplishments and consider possible improvements.

ASSOCIATES

Susan Carpenter
Mediator/Author
Riverside, California

Don Carper
Mediator/Professor
School of Business
CSU, Sacramento

Kathleen Kelly
Mediator/Professor
McGeorge School of Law

Lawrence Norton
Mediator
San Rafael, California

Betsy Watson
Mediator/Professor
Ctr./Resolution of
Environmental Disputes,
Humboldt State University

MEETING THE WORKSHOP OBJECTIVES

The workshop was designed with the purpose of meeting three objectives:

- To build workshop participant confidence in the process proposed for developing the Ecosystem Restoration Program Plan, and related objectives and targets;
- To receive constructive comments on the proposed process, and;
- To ensure agency and stakeholder participation in the development of targets.

Constructive comments and suggestions were raised during both of the question and answer sessions and also were provided by Mr. Fruge and Ms. Holland. Attached to this memo is the list of major outcomes and discussion points prepared for the 21 November BDAC meeting. At least one person during the question and answer session was prepared with detailed comments on the examples presented in the workshop packet. Others presented comments specific to their subjects of interest. In conversation during breaks individuals expressed interest in continuing to participate. This interest was reinforced as people requested the schedule of the technical meetings.

It is less clear that workshop participants were more confident in the target development process as a result of having attended the workshop. Some questions reflected concern about the data being used to establish potential targets. Another concern raised was how the proposed targets will achieve the Ecosystem Quality goal and objectives. Others expressed lack of clarity as to how the Program components

CENTER OFFICES

CSU, Sacramento
980 Ninth Street
Suite 300
Sacramento, CA 95814

Phone: (916) 445-2079
Fax: (916) 445-2087

McGeorge School of Law
3200 Fifth Avenue
Sacramento, CA 95817

Phone: (916) 739-7082
Fax: (916) 739-7066

link together and how CALFED actions will integrate with existing efforts. The following recommendations suggest ways to help build stakeholder confidence.

Recommendations

- Include a list of references or other sources of information to help document rationale in workshop material.
- Continue efforts to contact interested individuals prior to the workshop; this might include enclosing personalized notes in workshop packets, and requesting work group members to encourage their constituents to come to workshops.
- Consider the following factors when scheduling a workshop--availability of materials to be discussed, the timing of other venues where related information is disseminated, such as at technical meetings, and the relationship and timing of the workshop topic to other substantive elements in the CALFED program.
- Consider some limited involvement of working groups in workshop planning; this could include requesting names and addresses for potential participants, requesting feedback on agenda topics, and soliciting thoughts on upcoming issues.

AERT AND ERWG MEETING PRESENTATIONS PRIOR TO THE WORKSHOP

The presentations at these meetings were well done and the comments received from the meeting attendees were invaluable for improving the presentations at the workshop. The only drawback was that comments came too late for smooth preparation of the packet. The following recommendations may also increase participant confidence in the ERPP process.

Recommendations

- Prepare written reports prior to agency and work group presentations.
- Schedule presentations at least one week prior to final preparation of the packet.

PACKET PREPARATION

Preparation of the workshop packet was rushed resulting in the document being sent to reproduction services a day late.

Recommendation

- Lead staff should coordinate with all staff responsible for packet production. This will result in clear and firm assignments and deadlines.
- Set up a schedule for review of the packet and allow at least two to three days for final review. Keep reviewers up to date if schedule changes are necessary.
- Involve packet preparers in weekly planning meetings or updates to ensure preparation is occurring on schedule.
- When setting up assignments, clearly define consultant roles and revisit those roles when the situation demands an assessment.

LOGISTICS

Overall the logistics for the day of the workshop worked very smoothly. The room was of generous size for the plenary session. The displays appeared to be of interest to those attending. Participants were quickly registered.

Unfortunately, it was very difficult to read the speakers nameplates from the middle and back of the room. Not unexpectedly, side conversations took place in the hallway adjacent to the meeting room. While a normal activity, the hallway acted to amplify the conversations making it difficult for that side of the plenary room to hear the proceedings.

Recommendations

- For nameplates in the front of the room increase the type size.
- When available, use facilities with alcoves and rooms for side conversations.

FOLLOW-UP TO WORKSHOP

During the workshop debriefing meeting with Dick the idea of follow-up to the workshop was discussed. Dick decided that a summary of the workshop would be included as part of the advance notice mailing for the ERPP workshop.

Recommendation

- Consider including in the mailing, staff responses to written comments and participant worksheets submitted during the comment period.